

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are now pending in this application. In the April 5, 2007 Office Action, Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,455,933 to Kodama et al., (hereinafter “*Kodama*”).

For the reasons set forth below, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

### Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 1. In particular, *Kodama* fails to describe or suggest, “reading from each of the data storage devices one or more data storage device identifiers” as recited by claim 1. *Kodama* describes tape cassettes as data storage devices. The tape cassettes store data that is written and read by tape drives 102. However, *Kodama* does not describe reading data storage device identifiers from the tape cassettes. The portion of *Kodama* that is cited by the Office Action as teaching this recitation discusses storing a host ID. However, the host ID is an identifier associated with the host computer, not a data storage device identifier as recited by claim 1. *Kodama* does not suggest or describe, “determining from the data storage device identifiers whether the data storage device supports the security features,” as recited by claim 1. Rather, *Kodama* describes comparing a host ID associated with a command with a host ID that set security protection information, but doing so does not determine whether a tape cassette supports security features.

Further, the applicant respectfully submits that *Kodama* does not teach, suggest, or describe, “determining whether the data storage device is locked and returning from a powered off state or a hardware reset,” as recited by claim 1. The applicant submits that the *Kodama* disclosure does not in any way discuss or suggest determining whether any device is returning from a powered off state or from a hardware reset. The only discussion of a powered off state is to state that because the security protection information is stored in nonvolatile memory, it remains stored when the power of the

changer apparatus is turned off. Stating that information stored in nonvolatile memory survives a loss of power does not describe making a determination as to whether a device is returning from a powered off state or hardware reset. Similarly, *Kodama* does not suggest or describe, “in response to determining that the data storage device is locked and returning from a powered off state or a hardware reset, receiving from a user a password for unlocking the data storage device,” as recited by claim 1. As previously discussed, *Kodama* does not disclose taking any type of action based on whether a device is returning from a powered off state or a hardware reset. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 2

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe any recitation of dependent claim 2. The Office Action cites a portion of *Kodama* as teaching this recitation. However, the applicant submits that the neither the cited portion of *Kodama*, nor any portion of *Kodama*, discusses a POST and specifically a method for securing contents of a data storage device during a POST. For at least this reason, and because claim 2 depends from allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 2 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 3

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 3. In particular, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest, “determining whether limited access should be provided to each locked data storage device” and “preparing each locked data storage device for presentation to an operating system for limited access” or “isolating each locked data storage device from the operating system” according to the results of the determination, as recited by claim 3. The Office Action cites a portion of *Kodama* as teaching this recitation. However, the applicant submits that the neither the cited portion of *Kodama*, nor any portion of *Kodama*, discusses an embodiment in which a locked data storage device is presented to an operating system or

isolated from the operating system depending on a determination that limited access should or should not be provided. For at least this reason, and because claim 3 depends from allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 3 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 5

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 5. In particular, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest, “wherein the data storage devices are locked upon experiencing a powered off state, a sleep state, or a hardware reset,” as recited by claim 5. The cited portion of *Kodama* describes reserved information being released when power is turned off or when a reset signal is input. *Kodama* additionally describes placing security protection information in nonvolatile memory such that it remains stored when the power of the changer apparatus is turned off. However, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest the tape cassettes being locked when experiencing a powered off state, a sleep state, or a hardware reset. Even if security protection information remains stored when the power of the changer apparatus is turned off, the tape cassettes are not locked in that they could be manually removed from the changer apparatus and accessed via another apparatus. The nonvolatile memory storing the security protection information is within the changer apparatus and not within the tape cassettes, which are most similar to the recited data storage devices.

Further, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest, “determining whether a data storage device returning from a sleep state should be unlocked without requiring a user to enter a password,” as recited by claim 5. The applicant submits that neither the cited portion of *Kodama*, nor any portion of *Kodama*, discusses a data storage device returning from a sleep state, and specifically, determining whether a data storage device returning from a sleep state should be unlocked without requiring a user to enter a password. Similarly, *Kodama* fails to describe or suggest, “in response to determining that the data storage device should be unlocked without requiring a user to enter a password, storing the security password within a memory located outside the data storage device.” There is no discussion within *Kodama* with respect to storing a security password within a memory located inside and outside the data storage device under different conditions.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, and because claim 5 depends from allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 5 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 6

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 6. As discussed above with respect to claim 5, *Kodama* does not disclose “determining whether the data storage device is returning from a powered off sleep state,” as recited by claim 6. Additionally, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest, “determining whether the data storage device was unlocked prior to the sleep state,” and in response to determining that it was, “determining whether a data storage device returning from a sleep state should be unlocked without requiring a user to enter a password,” as recited by claim 6. As discussed above, *Kodama* does not describe a device returning from a sleep state and any corresponding actions taken with respect to decisions made regarding the device returning from a sleep state. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, and because claim 6 depends from allowable independent base claim 1, dependent claim 6 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 9

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 9. In particular, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest, “disabling, until a next power cycle, the security features that enable security passwords,” as recited by claim 9. There is no discussion within the *Kodama* disclosure regarding disabling security features until a next power cycle. For at least this reason, and because claim 9 depends from allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 9 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claims 10 and 11

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each

recitation of dependent claims 10 and 11. In particular, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest making any determinations or taking any actions with respect to a backup password. There is no mention of backup passwords in the *Kodama* disclosure. For at least this reason, and because claims 10 and 11 depend from allowable independent base claim 1, dependent claims 10 and 11 are allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 12. In particular, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest a password entry attempt counter or making any determinations or taking any actions with respect to a password entry attempt counter. For at least this reason, and because claim 12 depends from allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 12 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 13

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 13. In particular, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest a setup utility within the BIOS for controlling security passwords for a data storage device. In fact, there is no mention within the *Kodama* disclosure of a BIOS or a BIOS setup utility. For at least this reason, and because claim 13 depends from allowable independent claim 1, dependent claim 13 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Independent Claim 16

Independent claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 16. In particular, as discussed above with respect to dependent claim 13, there is no discussion within *Kodama* of a BIOS or a BIOS setup utility. Consequently, there is also no discussion within *Kodama* of a BIOS having “an operating system independent setup utility for controlling functions for manipulating data

storage device security,” as recited by claim 16. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claim 16 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 17

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 17. As discussed above, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest an operating system independent setup utility. Additionally, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest, “storing the security password on the selected data storage device,” as recited by claim 17. As discussed above, *Kodama* describes storing a security password on a changer apparatus and on a host device, not on a tape cassette or other data storage device. For at least this reason, and because claim 17 depends from allowable independent claim 16, dependent claim 17 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 18

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 18. As discussed above, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest an operating system independent setup utility. Additionally, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest an operating system independent setup utility or equivalent that is operative to “determine whether a hardware reset is performed when the setup utility is exited and in response to determining that the hardware reset is not performed when the setup utility is exited, exit the setup utility and remove power from the selected data storage device thereby locking the selected data storage device with the security password,” as recited by claim 18. *Kodama* does not describe a hardware reset or determining whether a hardware reset is performed. Consequently, *Kodama* cannot disclose determining whether a hardware reset is performed when a setup utility is exited and performing the corresponding recitations accordingly. For at least this reason, and because claim 18 depends from allowable independent base claim 16, dependent claim 18 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claim 19

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of dependent claim 19. *Kodama* does not describe or suggest disabling and then re-enabling security of a selected data storage device to validate a password. Accordingly, for at least this reason, and because claim 19 depends from allowable independent base claim 16, dependent claim 19 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Independent Claim 20

Independent claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kodama*. The applicant submits that *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe each recitation of independent claim 20. As discussed above, there is no discussion within *Kodama* of locking data storage devices upon experiencing a sleep state, determining whether the data storage device is returning from a sleep state, and taking any actions accordingly. Additionally, *Kodama* does not describe or suggest, “determining whether the data storage device was unlocked prior to the sleep state,” as recited by claim 20. The cited portion of *Kodama* describes an unlocking method for use with a changer apparatus, but not with respect to a sleep state or with regards to a sleep state determination. Accordingly, for at least this reason, independent claim 20 is allowable over *Kodama*.

#### Dependent Claims 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 21

Because *Kodama* fails to teach, suggest, or describe the recitations of claims 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 21 and because claims 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 21 depend from allowable independent claims 1 and 20, dependent claims 4, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 21 are allowable over *Kodama*.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

/Michael J. Baldauff, Jr./

Date: July 5, 2007

---

Michael J. Baldauff, Jr.  
Reg. No. 57,998

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC  
1720 Peachtree Street, N.W.  
Suite 1010  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309  
Telephone: 404.815.1900

**53377**

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE